



United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Kremmling Field Office
2103 E. Park Avenue, PO Box 68
Kremmling, CO 80459



RESOURCE ADVISORY COUNCIL SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING #8

Tuesday, June 29, 2010- (5:00 – 9:00 PM)

**Kremmling Chamber Building
203 Park Avenue, Kremmling, CO**

SUMMARY NOTES

Attendees: Clare Bastable (NW RAC/Subgroup Leader), John Brammer, (Motorized Recreation), Jim McDaniel (Hunting - Hunting Outfitters), Randy Miller (Motorized Recreation-Snowmobiling/Oil & Gas Dvlpmt), Carol Petersen (Grazing), Andrew Peterson (Fishing/Outfitters), Holly Whitten (Non-Motorized Recreation), Dennis Gale (KFO RMP Proj Mgr), Dave Stout (Field Mgr), Cliff Jarman (RMP Contact Proj Mgr).

Handouts:

- Northwest Colorado Resource Advisory Council guidance for RMP Subgroups
- Slide presentation on Travel Management
- Travel Management maps and CDs

WELCOME

Dennis Gale (KFO RMP Project Mgr) welcomed everyone and thanked them for their participation. This was followed by a round robin of introductions.

PLANNING PROCESS OVERVIEW (WHAT HAS HAPPENED SINCE OUR LAST MEETING- Powerpoint) – Dennis Gale, BLM KFO

- At the last meeting on May 6, 2010, BLM caught the Subgroup up on RMP developments that had been occurring since the February 9, 2009 meeting, and, due to the elapsed time between meetings, reacquainted the group with the revision.
- BLM presented a brief review of the alternative themes.

PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATION (Powerpoint) – Cliff Jarman, Tetra Tech

- The BLM would like the groups thoughts on a 'preferred' alternative (ie – does the group favor one of the alternative over the others?)
- Cliff explained that the Subgroup should not get hung up on the BLM's selection of a Preferred Alternative. Designating a Preferred Alternative at this stage of the planning process is a regulatory requirement and the BLM must identify one of the alternatives as 'preferred'. The Subgroup should consider this designation in the context of the next stage of the process where a "Proposed RMP" will be developed that could look differ quite a bit from the current 'preferred' selection. The Proposed RMP may contain portions of the other alternatives. Cliff used a simplified diagram to explain this concept to the group.

TRAVEL MANAGEMENT (Powerpoint) – John Monkouski, BLM KFO

- John Monkouski presented the *Methods of Analysis* used for assessing the environmental impacts of implementing the alternatives, emphasizing the point that Comprehensive Trails and Travel Management, a resource use, is a support function for all resource programs. As such, the planning area's travel route network was adjusted and assessed for each alternative based on what would best serve the needs for public access, administrative access and resource management.
- John then presented a list of *Assumptions* that were used in conducting the assessment of impacts to trails and travel management under each alternative.
- John also illustrated and explained the RMP Interdisciplinary Team process used for developing the travel management database, including: compiling and analyzing public comments of the existing route system; applying preliminary screening criteria for closing routes to public use based on environmental conditions such as soil stability, wildlife habitat, special status species habitat, proximity for riparian areas, etc; evaluation of route conditions, purpose, conflicts, administrative use, public access, etc.
- A Summary chart of the proposed travel route system by alternative was displayed, indicating the acres of the KFO public lands portion of the planning area that would be designated as open, closed, or limited to designated or existing routes.
- A chart was also presented indicating the miles of routes, by alternative, that would be available for travel by full size vehicle, ATVs, motorbikes, mechanized vehicles (such as bicycles and carts), foot and horse, foot only, administrative use only, and the miles of routes proposed for decommissioning.

DISCUSSION BY GROUP – (All)

- Issues and concerns raised and discussed following the powerpoint presentation included:
 - Closure of roads to game retrieval. How are hunters going to retrieve harvested game animals in areas where routes are closed and decommissioned? (Jim McDaniel)
 - How are the physically handicapped or aging hunters going to access hunting areas where roads have been closed? (Jim McDaniel)
 - Has BLM considered the additional costs to hunters for game retrieval that would result from closing roads, such as having to rent horses to retrieve downed game? (Jim McDaniel)
 - With limited routes and riding areas there are fewer opportunities for motorized use and congested trails could become a safety issue. (John Brammer)
 - Has BLM considered travel route decisions, management, and compatibility of the proposed route systems with regard to adjoining USFS lands in the Strawberry area (Holly Whitten)
 - More discussion ensued regarding whether or not there was enough BLM land for a motorized trail system of say 20 miles. John Brammer noted that he could spend a whole weekend on 20 miles of system trails.
 - Closure of the North Sand Hills in Alternative C could have serious economic impacts on Walden. (Randy Miller)
 - How would off-road access and parking be managed with regard to camping?
 - Would snowmobile access be limited to roads (Jim McDaniel and Randy Miller)?
 - How would travel management protect sage grouse leks?
 - How would travel management affect access to the Colorado River?
 - How is the issue of motorized boating being addressed in the RMP alternatives?
 - John Monkouski explained the administrative route designation. For instance, grazing would include administrative designations for access routes associated with the grazing permit. The permittee might have access on a route for grazing that might be closed to the general public. The access could be needed by the permittee for range improvements (wells, ditches, fencing, etc) and for emergency needs.
 - John also explained that, to provide for equal recreation use, only those routes that have legal public access to all would be managed for motorized opportunities. Isolated parcels of BLM

lands would have existing routes either designated as administrative or not open for recreational motorized use. This would also protect the private lands from motorized use trespass. Isolated parcels could have routes analyzed for future motorized use should new public access be acquired. Additions and modifications to the designated route system can be done through NEPA at the EA level. Area wide designations such as “open” or “closed” would have to be done through a plan amendment.

HANDOUTS

- KFO Planning Area Travel Zone Map
- Copy of Powerpoint Presentations

ACTION ITEMS

- Provide BLM with SubGroup thoughts on a preferred alternative.

NEXT MEETING

- No future meetings were scheduled.